IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE TWENTIETH DAY OF APRIL
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ELIPE DHARMA RAO

WRIT PETITION NO : 8989 of 2005

Between:

Saketi Maheswara Rao, s/o late Latchayya,
r/o Jagannadhavalasa Village, G.Sigadam Mandal, Srikakulam District.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The District Collector, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam.
2 The Joint Collector, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam, A.P.
3 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam A.P.
4 Sri Aljangi Mohan Rao, s/o Pentayya,
r/o Jagannadhapuram Village, G.Sigadam Mandal, Srikakulam District.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to declare the action of the respondent No.1 in not taking any action on the Revision Petition filed by the petitioner on 15-4-2005 as well as setting-aside the order of the respondent No.3 by the respondent No.2 as illegal, arbitrary, and unjust by issuing any appropriate writ, order or direction especially one in the nature of writ of mandamus and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.M.A.KHADER

Counsel for the Respondents: GP FOR CIVIL SUPPLIES

The Court, at the stage of admission, made the following :

ORDER:

The 3rd respondent appointed the petitioner as a fair price shop dealer –II of Jagannadhavalasa Village on 08.04.2002. Aggrieved thereby, the 4th respondent preferred an appeal before the 2nd respondent, who set aside the order of the 3rd respondent and directed to notify the vacancy afresh and make appointment as per rules. Subsequently, against the orders of the 2nd respondent, the petitioner preferred a revision before the 1st respondent on 15.04.2005 together with an application for stay. The grievance of the petitioner is that no orders have been passed even in the stay application so far, and seeks appropriate directions in this regard.

Under these circumstances, I deem it appropriate to dispose of the writ petition directing the 1st respondent to expedite the hearing of the appeal itself, and pass appropriate orders therein, as early as possible, not later than six weeks from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

20.04.2005

TS

To

1 The District Collector, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam.
2 The Joint Collector, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam, A.P.
3 The Revenue Divisional Officer, Srikakulam District, Srikakulam A.P.
4 2 CCS to the G.P. for Civil Supplies, High Court of A.P., Hyderabad

5 2 CD copies.